



CTMS Compatibility SIG Teleconference Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date	August 6, 2004 12-1 PM EDT																											
Attendees:	<p>Working group coordinator: Scott Finley (Booz Allen Hamilton) Arumani Manisundaram (Booz Allen Hamilton) Harshawardhan Bal (Booz Allen Hamilton)</p> <p>Participants:</p> <table><tr><th>Name</th><th>Email</th><th>Organization</th></tr><tr><td>Teri Melese (SIG Lead)</td><td>tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu</td><td>UCSF</td></tr><tr><td>John Speakman (SIG Lead)</td><td>speakman@biost.mskcc.org</td><td>Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center</td></tr><tr><td>Kim Johnson</td><td>Kim.Johnson@duke.edu</td><td>Duke Univ.</td></tr><tr><td>Brenda Duggan</td><td>dugganb@mail.nih.gov</td><td>NCI</td></tr><tr><td>Warren Kibbe</td><td>wakibbe@northwestern.edu</td><td>Northwestern Univ.</td></tr><tr><td>Lara Fournier</td><td>fourniel@ohsu.edu</td><td>OHSU</td></tr><tr><td>Karen Kimura</td><td>KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu</td><td>UCSF</td></tr><tr><td>Sorena Nadaf</td><td>s.nadaf@vanderbilt.edu</td><td>Vanderbilt Univ.</td></tr></table>	Name	Email	Organization	Teri Melese (SIG Lead)	tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu	UCSF	John Speakman (SIG Lead)	speakman@biost.mskcc.org	Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center	Kim Johnson	Kim.Johnson@duke.edu	Duke Univ.	Brenda Duggan	dugganb@mail.nih.gov	NCI	Warren Kibbe	wakibbe@northwestern.edu	Northwestern Univ.	Lara Fournier	fourniel@ohsu.edu	OHSU	Karen Kimura	KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu	UCSF	Sorena Nadaf	s.nadaf@vanderbilt.edu	Vanderbilt Univ.
Name	Email	Organization																										
Teri Melese (SIG Lead)	tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu	UCSF																										
John Speakman (SIG Lead)	speakman@biost.mskcc.org	Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center																										
Kim Johnson	Kim.Johnson@duke.edu	Duke Univ.																										
Brenda Duggan	dugganb@mail.nih.gov	NCI																										
Warren Kibbe	wakibbe@northwestern.edu	Northwestern Univ.																										
Lara Fournier	fourniel@ohsu.edu	OHSU																										
Karen Kimura	KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu	UCSF																										
Sorena Nadaf	s.nadaf@vanderbilt.edu	Vanderbilt Univ.																										
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductory remarks (update since last meeting)<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Slides from face to face meeting sent to Joyce Niland for presentation at the 8/2 Strategic group meeting (the meeting was cancelled)▪ Slides from Warren Kibbe on the notion of validated tests (follow up to discussion at the face to face) were also sent▪ Update on the next strategic group meeting and any thoughts or issues about sharing this information with the Strategic Group (Joyce Niland ~comment if available)• Discussion of validated tests (Warren Kibbe)<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ see PDF file provided• An opportunity to begin the process of defining CaBIG alignment and capability has been offered to our SIG																											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ strategy is to begin to define the process using three test cases ▪ this process will be tightly coupled with the best practices Architecture group at the NCI ▪ all development of the process will be shared with the CaBIG compatibility SIG participants for review and comments (by email and on the conference calls) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteers to be part of the best practices architecture group? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Warren has volunteered, any others?
<p>General discussion points raised by participants:</p>	<p>The requirements for a validation suite for testing caBIG compatibility were discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue of philosophical alignment with caBIG and certification or benchmarking of caBIG compatibility was raised. It was felt that claims for any level of caBIG compatibility should be made only if the compatibility of a system or its component modules has been validated in a reliable, testable manner. An objective set of criteria should be established for validation of compatibility and no intermediate levels can be defined. In other words, if a gold or silver level compatibility cannot be demonstrated for a system or a module, it would be a bronze level (again, if that can be assessed with a validation suite). These criteria should also be established in a uniform manner so that they can be applied consistently across geographical boundaries. Compliance test may also be based on inclusion of standardized vocabularies like CTC 3.0 for an adverse event module. Arumani Manisundaram and Warren Kibbe (Northwestern U. - Robert H. Lurie CCC) will coordinate the Architecture and Compatibility workspaces for efforts in this direction. • It was felt that commercial systems cannot (yet) be caBIG compatible, since that implies certification (which doesn't yet exist) in addition to architecture. Teri suggested "caBIG Aligned" and Scott Finley suggested that they could claim to be "planning caBIG compatibility," "seeking certification," or "ensuring that products are as compatible as possible with these evolving standards." • It was generally agreed that a closed solution (a gray or black box where limited or no API may be available for accessing the system) is acceptable if interoperability between systems can be achieved. • Processes for CDE curation from developers need to be made public • Recurring meetings for the Compatibility SIG were scheduled for the 1st and 3rd Fridays every month (next meeting: August 20,

	2004, 12-1 PM EDT)
Action items:	<p>1. Develop validation tests for caBIG compatibility in coordination with Arumani Manisundaram and Warren Kibbe</p> <p>2. Determine what tests need to be performed on systems or individual components to assess level of caBIG compatibility (viz., bronze, silver or gold)</p>